

REMARKS

Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Claims 39-42 were previously canceled. Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, and 19 are in independent form. Claims 2-3, 5-6 and 15-18 depend from claim 1, claims 7-11 depend from claim 4, claim 14 depends from claim 13, and claims 20-38 depend from claim 19. Claims 1, 4, 16 and 19 have been amended. No new matter has been entered.

Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 12-14 and claims 4, 7-10, 27, 29, 33-34, and 36-38. Claim 4 has been amended into independent form in view of the indication of allowable subject matter. Claims 4, and 7-11 are submitted to be in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-3, 5, 11, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,164,496 to Gregory in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,383,605 to Teague. Claim 6 was rejected in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,405,086 to Kranzle. Claims 19-26, 28, 30-32, and 35 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gregory in view of Teague and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,571,807 to Jones.

With respect to the rejection of claim 1, claim 1 relates to a pressure washer having an injector that is operable to pump at least one of a fluid and a first chemical at a low pressure, and that is configured to selectively spray a fluid and a fluid plus a second chemical at high pressure. What is meant by “selectively spray” is that the user can select to pump a fluid alone at high pressure or a fluid plus a second chemical at high pressure.

In contrast, Gregory teaches a device that pumps either a fluid plus a first chemical at low pressure or a fluid alone at high pressure. The injector of Gregory has a port 92 that closes when the injector is in the high pressure spray mode. (*See* Gregory, col. 4, lines 49-67 (with particular reference to lines 63-67)). The modes of use of the brush and sprayer of Gregory are fully described in col. 4, lines 39 to col. 5, line 54. Thus, Gregory does not teach a pressure washer having an injector where a second liquid is dispensed at high pressure.

Teague teaches a pressure washer having a spray lance and three chemical tanks with associated chemical inlets. The tanks are remotely operated via electronic controls on the handle of the spray lance. The tanks may be opened and closed to dispense a chemical into the liquid that flows to the injector. The chemical tanks of Teague are positioned downstream of the pump

such that the chemicals must pass through the pump during operation. Teague does not teach a chemical input positioned upstream of the pump. Thus, even when Teague and Gregory are combined, they still do not teach a liquid plus a second chemical at high pressures. Thus, the cited combination does not teach the subject matter of claim 1 or the claims that depend therefrom.

With respect to claim 16, Teague teaches that the first chemical is injected prior to the pump. In contrast, claim 16 specifies that the first chemical is introduced after the pump. Thus, in addition to the reasons stated above in connection with claim 1, claim 16 is also submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

Claims 6 is submitted to be allowable over the cited combination for the reasons discussed above in connection with claim 1. Kranzle teaches a cart, but claim 6 is submitted to be allowable over the combination because neither Gregory, Teague, nor Kranzle teaches the use of a second chemical plus a fluid at high pressure, where the second chemical input is downstream of the nozzle.

Claim 19 was rejected based upon the combination of Gregory, Teague, and Jones. Jones teaches a variable speed pump in a pressure washer. Claim 19 specifies three modes of operation—a first mode where a low pressure fluid and a chemical are sprayed, a second mode where a high pressure fluid (without chemical) is sprayed, and a third mode where a high pressure fluid plus a chemical is sprayed. As explained above in connection with claim 1, Gregory does not teach the third mode since it only teaches the use of a chemical at low pressure spraying. Teague and Jones do not remedy the deficiencies of Gregory. If the chemical of Teague were used with the injector of Gregory at high pressure, a chemical would be required to pass through the nozzle in high pressure mode, which is contrary to the claimed invention. For these reasons, claim 19, and the claims that depend therefrom, are submitted to be allowable over the cited combination.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this application with a view towards allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney if a telephone call could help to resolve any remaining issues.

A fee associated with one additional independent claim is submitted herewith. No other fees are believed to be required. However, should any other fees be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to deposit account No. 50-1432.

Respectfully submitted,



Lorri W. Cooper Reg. No. 40,038

JONES DAY
901 Lakeside Avenue
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 586-7097

Date: September 26, 2007